

United States Patent and Trademark Office

m

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,550 10/31/2003		Susan J. Wong	454311-2232.1	9527
20999 FROMMER L	7590 02/13/2007 AWRENCE & HAUG		EXAMINER	
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.		HURT, SHARON L		
NEW YORK, NY 10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1648	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2007	PAPER ·

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/699,550	WONG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Sharon Hurt	1648		

		Charon hart	10-10					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
	HE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
	☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
-	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin							
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
C. 4	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on 24 August 2006. A bri	ef in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37	must be filed within	two months of				
	the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any replandments	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	41.37(e)), to avoid dis	missal of the				
=	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co							
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below							
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for				
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
4. 🔲			mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. 🔯	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
6. 🗍	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a			ent canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s). 7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
	Claim(s) allowed:							
	Claim(s) objected to:	202						
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>74,76-105,126-128,145,156 and 162-2</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<u>202</u> .						
AFFII	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the affidavit or other evidence is entered.	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.				
	The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s): June 22	<u>2, 2006.</u>					
, U. L	<u> </u>							

Continuation of Number 11.

The proposed amendments do not overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. and Valdes et al. in view of Mandy et al., Scaramozzino et al. and McDonell et al. for reasons of record. The proposed amendments do not overcome the provisional double patenting rejection as claiming the same invention as copending Application No. 10/839,442 for reasons of record.

BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Sme ampell